arXiv:hep-ph/0102235v1 19 Feb 2001

IS A COHERENT PICTURE OF MASSIVE NEUTRINOS EMERGING?

FRANCESCO VISSANI
INFN, Lab. Naz. Gran Sasso, Theory Group, I-67010 Assergi (AQ), Italy
E-mail: vissani@lngs.infn.it

The hypothesis that neutrinos are massive has a strong experimental support; however, the information we have is quite limited, and many possibilities are open. Theoretical considerations might help fill the gaps (or foresee regularities), as we illustrate with a specific example.

Several experiments suggest that the neutrinos oscillate in flavor, as expected if they are massive; the strongest indication is the atmospheric neutrino deficit. However, most of available information can be dubbed as flavor disappearance and this is perhaps the main reason of doubt (the signal of $\bar{\nu}_{\rm e}$ appearance seen in the LSND experiment will be tested soon). More specific statements rely on details of the data or analyses, and have a less compelling significance at present[a].

The safest approach would be to wait for more data. If instead one tries to interpret all the indications by oscillations, one has to answer the Sphinx question: Are three neutrinos enough? If the negative opinion is expressed, one has to confront with sterile neutrinos, 6 possible arrangements of the mass levels, not to speak of the number of mixings and phases. Suspending the judgement on LSND indications, we can instead explain the deficit of atmospheric and solar neutrinos with three neutrinos only. Since we just need to have two different frequencies of oscillation (=doublets of levels) there are 2 spectra compatible with what we know. One of these spectra looks very different from those of charged fermions ("inverted" spectrum). Both of them, in principle, could be offset by a common mass scale, that does not affect oscillations (up to the case of quasi "degenerate" spectra). The best bet possibility seems to be the one where the spectrum looks "charged-fermion like"; "normal" spectrum, no large mass offset. We take this case as reference, and concentrate the discussion on 4 questions: *Q1 What is the weight of neutrinos? Q2 Are neutrinos Majorana particles? Q3 Are large angles maximal? Q4 Do oscillation with "atmospheric" frequency involve all flavors?* (to rephrase the latter one; Do we have plain $\nu_\mu \to \nu_\tau$ oscillations, or also a bit of $\nu_{\rm e}$?). In comparison, the question in the title seems easy–the answer being a plain "no".

So, we try with some theory. Since we have been lead to assume that the largest mass scale is $(\Delta m^2_{atm})^{1/2} = 40-70$ meV, no doubt that *Q1* is hard for experiments. Now; how does the mass matrix looks keeping *only* this scale? Here is the answer:

$$\mathcal{M} = m_3 \cdot v_3^t \otimes v_3, \text{where } v_3 \approx (\varepsilon, s, s) \text{ and } m_3 = (\Delta m^2_{atm})^{1/2}; \qquad (1)$$

the approximate equality of the ν_μ and ν_τ components accounts for almost maximal atmospheric mixing ($s^{-1} = \sqrt{2}$—with *Q3* called into play by the sign "$\approx$"); *Q4* can

[a] SuperKamiokande (SK) obtained neutral currents enriched samples, becoming sensitive to ν_τ oscillated from atmospheric ν_μ; and the quality of L/E tests is improving (SK, MACRO, Soudan2). Since $\sigma(\nu_\mu {\rm e})/\sigma(\nu_{\rm e}{\rm e}) \approx 1/6$ at $E_\nu \sim 7$ MeV, SK has also some sensitivity to an oscillated flavor for solar neutrinos; SNO can improve on that, using $\nu D \to \nu\, p\, n$ ($\nu = \nu_{{\rm e},\mu,\tau}$).

be reformulated as: What is the value of ε (the upper bound being $\sim 1/6$). Carrying on the outer product $\otimes$, one notes that the $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ sector is the "dominant block" of the mass matrix (with null determinant), whereas the entry $\mathcal{M}_{\rm ee}$ arises at order ε^2 (that is sad if we want to answer *Q2* experimentally[b]). What is the effect of the other two neutrinos? The relevant mass scale is $m_{sol} = (\Delta m^2_{sol})^{1/2} < 15$ meV, and the range $5 - 9$ meV is favored by present solar neutrino data (with Homestake results playing an important role). As a reference value, we will keep in mind the mass ratio $m_{sol} = m_{atm}/10$. We add now to the mass matrix the terms $m_2 \cdot v_2^t \otimes v_2$ and $m_1 \cdot v_1^t \otimes v_1$, with $m_2^2 - m_1^2 = m_{sol}^2$ (and m_1 not much larger than m_{sol} in view of the discussion above) with the condition that the 3 versors v_i are orthogonal. Since v_3 describes the state $\nu_3 \sim \nu_+ \equiv (\nu_\mu + \nu_\tau)/\sqrt{2}$, $v_{1,2}$ describe the system[c] $\nu_{\rm e} - \nu_-$; the solar neutrino deficit requires them to be mixed. The main consequences of the new terms are that: *a)* the element $\mathcal{M}_{\rm ee}$ seems to receive a contribution order $m_3/10$ (that might be sufficient to address *Q2* experimentally); *b)* the elements $\mathcal{M}_{{\rm e}\mu}$ and $\mathcal{M}_{{\rm e}\tau}$ become different, but presumably remaining 1/10 of the larger ones or so; *c)* the other elements get minor corrections, that however turn the determinant of the dominant block non-zero. One can force a bit the matter and assume that the *structure* of the mass matrix $\mathcal{M}$ (namely, the powers of ε) remain almost the same, up to unknown factors $\mathcal{O}(1)$. Indeed, the parameter $\mathcal{M}_{\rm ee}$ *could* remain order ϵ^2, if the contributions from the 2 lighter neutrinos have opposite sign and tend to compensate each other. We hit then:

$$\mathcal{M} \stackrel{\mathcal{O}(1)}{=} \frac{\langle H \rangle^2}{M_X} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \epsilon^2 & \epsilon & \epsilon \\ \epsilon & 1 & 1 \\ \epsilon & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{with} \quad \begin{cases} \langle H \rangle = 174 \text{ GeV} \\ M_X = (8-16) \cdot 10^{15} \text{ GeV} \end{cases} \tag{2}$$

with $\varepsilon \sim m_\mu/m_\tau$ suggested by charged lepton masses and U(1) family symmetry. Grand unification seems to underlie the neutrino mass scale. Now let us go from eq. 2 onward. A little determinant in the dominant block comes from unknown $\mathcal{O}(1)$ coefficients with a little but not unreasonable chance. In this respect, the triplet mechanism for neutrino mass is more predictive than usual seesaw; it disfavors large hierarchies, favoring thus the solar neutrino solutions with large m_{sol}.

Q1 and *Q2* would be too difficult. *Q3* would get negative answers (but model does not give its best for solar neutrinos). The answer to *Q4* would be yes; the model would make a point if the electronic mixing $U_{\rm e3}$ is ~ 0.04 ($\approx \varepsilon$, up to $\mathcal{O}(1)$ factors). To summarize: The picture we discussed encourages other theoretical efforts, and leads us to expect that the future will be again in oscillations experiments.

References

1. The present study developed from J Sato and T Yanagida, *Phys. Lett.* B **430**, 127 (1998), *Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl.* **77**, 293 (1999), *Phys. Lett.* B **493**, 356 (2000); F Vissani, *JHEP* **9811**, 025 (1998); M Tanimoto, `hep-ph/0010088`.

[b] A crucial difference between *Q1* and *Q2* lies in the foreseen sensitivity of the experimental setups; more precisely, in the alternative hypothesis $\mathcal{M}_{\rm ee} \sim m_3$, realistic neutrinoless-double beta decay experiments would find a signal, whereas $m_{\nu_{\rm e}} \sim m_3$ would be invisible in tritium endpoint spectra.
[c] Account of additional terms order ε changes the mass matrix by very little amount.